

Appl. No. : 10/762,021
Filed : January 20, 2004

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed November 23, 2004, Applicant has amended the application as above. No new matter is added by the amendments as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the remarks set forth below.

Discussion of Claim Amendments

Claims 4 and 7 have been amended. Claims 9 and 10 have been added. Upon the entry of the amendments, Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. The amendments to Claim 4 are made merely for clarification and do not narrow the scope of protection. The amendment to Claim 7 is supported by, for example, Figure 2c. New Claims 9 and 10 are supported by, for example, Figure 2d. Thus, no new matter is added by the claim amendments. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments.

Discussion of Drawing Objections

The Examiner objected to the drawings asserting that Figures 1a-1d should be designated by a legend such as – Prior Art – because only that which is old is illustrated. In reply, Applicant has labeled Figures 1a-1d accordingly.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings asserting that various figures are too small to read the reference numerals and understand critical features. In reply, Applicant submits herewith a set of formal drawings that overcome the objections. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Specification Objections

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of some informalities. In reply, Applicant has amended the corresponding portions of the disclosure as suggested by the Examiner as reflected in the “Amendments to the Specification” section. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. : **10/762,021**
Filed : **January 20, 2004**

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1-20. Each of the attached sheets, which have been conformed to U.S. practice, replaces each of the original sheets.

Attachment: Replacement sheets

Appl. No. : 10/762,021
Filed : January 20, 2004

Discussion of Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In reply, Applicant has amended Claim 4 as reflected in the “Amendments to the Claims” section. Applicant believes that Claim 4, as amended, is clear and definite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ruddell (U.S. Patent No. 1,427,419). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s claim rejections.

Standard of Anticipation

“For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference.” *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 850 F.ed 675, 677, 7 USPQ 2d 1315, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Discussion of Patentability of Independent Claims 1 and 7

Independent Claim 1 recites, among other things, a finger piece, having a front middle finger portion, a front third finger portion and a front little finger portion which are *integrally formed*, coupled to the finger end of the palm piece. Amended Claim 7 includes substantially the same feature. As discussed below, Ruddell does not disclose the above-recited feature.

Ruddell discloses that a front first finger portion (29), a front second finger portion (30) and a front little finger portion (31) are separately formed. *See Figure 3*. Specifically, the first finger portion (29), the second finger portion (30) and the little finger portion (31) are sewn on the finger portions (4, 5, 6) of the palm piece (1), respectively. *See page 8, lines 1-7, 20-23, 43-48, and 63-67, and Figures 1 and 3*.

In contrast, in the claimed invention, the front middle finger portion, the front third finger portion and the front little finger portion are integrally formed as recited in Claims 1 and 7. As exemplified in Figure 2c (see reference numeral “500”), the three finger portions (6, 7, 12) are integrally formed as a single piece (500). However, Ruddell does not disclose the above-

Appl. No. : **10/762,021**
Filed : **January 20, 2004**

indicated feature of the claimed invention. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that Ruddell does not disclose all of the features of each of Claims 1 and 7. Thus, each of Claims 1 and 7 is not anticipated by Ruddell.

According to one embodiment of the invention, sewing lines are reduced since individual sewing of each finger portion is not required. This is because the three finger portions are integrally formed as a single finger piece, and *only* the single finger piece is coupled to *the finger end*. However, in a conventional glove such as Ruddell, more sewing lines are formed since each of the finger portions (29, 30, 31) is individually sewn on the palm piece (1) from the top portions (O, N, L; see Figures 1 and 3) all the way down to the wrist line (16). If there are more sewing lines, a worker can feel discomfort or even pain over time because the sewing lines press the fingers when the worker is doing, for example, welding. If the worker feels pain in his hand, he has to take off the glove frequently during work or rub his fingers. This can reduce work speed and efficiency. However, according to one embodiment of the invention, since the reduced sewing lines cause virtually no pain or relatively much less pain in the fingers, work efficiency is greatly increased. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 7 would not have made been obvious over Ruddell, either. Thus, Claims 1 and 7 are allowable over Ruddell.

Claims 2-6 and 8 depend from base Claim 1 or 7, and further define additional technical features of the present invention. In view of the patentability of their base claims, and in further view of their additional technical features, the dependent claims are patentable over the prior art of record.

Discussion of Patentability of New Claims

Each of new Claims 9 and 10 includes all of the features of Claims 1 and 7, respectively, and further recites “the thumb piece is substantially reverse “V” shaped so as to surround the thumbhole.” In Ruddell, the thumb piece (26) is sized substantially the same as the thumb portion (7), and is directly sewn on the thumb portion (7) along the lines of A-B-C-D-E. Thus, the contacting surfaces between the thumb piece (26) and the thumb portion (7) are restricted to the lines of A-B-C-D-E. *See Figures 1 and 2.*

Appl. No. : 10/762,021
Filed : January 20, 2004

In contrast, in the claimed invention, the thumb piece is substantially reverse "V" shaped so as to surround the thumbhole. According to one embodiment of the invention (see, for example, "14" in Figure 2c), there is a less danger of the sewing line being cut by a sharp object than that of the Ruddell glove since the reverse "V" shaped thumb piece surrounds the thumbhole and provides much more contacting surfaces on the palm portion than that of the Ruddell glove.

In view of the patentability of their base claims, and in further view of their additional technical features discussed above, the new claims are patentable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of Applicant's amendments and foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: _____

5/20/05

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

1721520
051905